DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 001 RC 006 219

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Bass, Willard P.; And Others |
| TITLE | An Evaluation of the Bordertown Dormitory Program. |
| INSTITUTION | Southwestern Cooperative Educational Lab., Albuquerque, N. Mex. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Bureau of Indian Affairs (Dept. of Interior), Window Rock, Ariz. |
| PUB DATE | Apr 71 |
| NOTE | 68p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Academic Achievement; *American Indians; Community Attitudes; *Dormitories; Educational Facilities; Interviews; Parent Attitudes; Program Costs; *Program Evaluation; *School Environment; Student Evaluation |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Navajos |

ABSTRACT

The Bordertown Dormitory Program, providing Navajo students with experience in attending schools in off-reservation communities with non-Indian children, was evaluated in terms of the success of students; adequacy of dormitory and school facilities and programs; attitudes of students, parents, school personnel, and townspeople toward the program; and comparative costs of the program and other financial considerations. An interviewing team inspected dormitories, visited classes, and interviewed dormitory students and staff, non-Indian students, townspeople, and school superintendents, faculty, and board members. A total of 407 dormitory students (grades 8-12) and 225 school teachers were interviewed. Among the findings were that grade point averages and class rankings are somewhat lower than those of students in other types of schools; Bordertown students generally attend schools with excellent facilities, well-qualified teachers, high scholastic standards, and broad curricular offerings; and the average cost of educating a Bordertown student was $1921 as compared to $1176 for a Bureau of Indian Affairs student (1969-70 fiscal year). Recommendations are presented for each evaluated area. Appendices present information on dormitories visited, school enrollment guidelines (1970-71), responses of Bordertown students and teachers, and a sample Indian Education Program Public School Contract. (FF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
JUN 9 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ED 064001

# AN EVALUATION OF THE BORDERTOWN DORMITORY PROGRAM

by

Willard P. Bass

with

Jimmy Baker, Dennis Billie, Ralph Davis,
Fritz Poocha, Pauleen Sanchez, and John Tippeconnic, Jr.

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory
117 Richmond Drive NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110

April, 1971

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Southwestern Cooperative Educational Lab. TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1971

This study was funded through a contract with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office, Contract No. N00 C 1420 3411. The views and findings stated herein are not necessarily those of the U.S. Office of Education, and no endorsement is stated or implied.

RC006219

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

By a stroke of good fortune it was possible to have as co-laborers on this project six Indian teachers who are enrolled in a special master's degree program at Pennsylvania State University and are currently working as interns in the Navajo area. It was they who interviewed all the students, teachers, dormitory staff, parents, and graduates. Their invaluable suggestions and labors, and especially, their companionship as we traveled about conducting the survey, are deeply appreciated. Special thanks are due John Tippeconnic, Jr., for taking the responsibility for scheduling the interns for the various site visits.

Appreciation is also extended to students, principals, and staff of the bordertown dormitories, to superintendents, principals, counselors, teachers, and other faculty members of the bordertown schools, to parents and graduates, and to Navajo area officials for their generous assistance in providing the requested information.

We are grateful to Wilma Beery for her help in compiling and tabulating data.

Special acknowledgement is due Cathryn Reed, project secretary, whose handling of correspondence, compilation of data, and skillful preparation of the final copy are deeply appreciated.

W.P.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


I. INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

II. SURVEY OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES . . . . . 2

III. THE BORDERTOWN DORMITORY STUDENTS . . . . 3

Student Backgrounds . . . . . 3
Enrollments . . . . . 4
Transfers and Dropouts . . . . . 4

IV. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT . . . . . 9

Grades and Class Ranks . . . . . 9
Achievement Test Results . . . . . 10

V. THE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES . . . . . 17

Curricula . . . . . 17
Counseling . . . . . 18
General Observations . . . . . 18
Participation in School Activities . . . . . 19
Opinions of Dormitory Students. . . . . 20
Opinions of Teachers . . . . . 21
Views of School Administrators . . . . . 23
Observations by Some Non-Indian Students . . . . . 24
Community Attitudes . . . . . 24

VI. THE DORMITORIES . . . . . 26

Students Comments . . . . . 26
Responses of Dormitory Principals and Staff Members . 27
Team Observations of Dormitories . . . . . 28

VII. EVALUATIONS BY PARENTS AND GRADUATES . . . 29

Opinions of Parents . . . . . 29
Responses of Graduates of 1962 . . . . . 31
Recent Graduates . . . . . 32

VIII. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS . . . . . 34

Comparative Costs . . . . . 34
Bureau Support to School Districts . . . . . 34

IX. SUMMARY . . . . . 38

The Bordertown Dormitory Students . . . . . 38
Academic Achievement . . . . . 39
Schools and Dormitories . . . . . 39
The Dormitories . . . . . 42
Evaluations by Parents and Graduates . . . . . 43
Financial Considerations . . . . . 44

X. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 46

Continuation of the Bordertown Dormitory Program . . 46
Schools . . . . . 46
Dormitories . . . . . 48
Financial Considerations . . . . . 50

REFERENCES . . . . . 52

APPENDIXES:

Appendix A. Schools and Dormitories Visited by the Evaluation Team . . . . . 53

Appendix B. School Enrollment Guidelines 1970-71 School Year . . . . . 55

Appendix C. Responses of Bordertown Students to Interview Guide Items . . . . . 57

Appendix D. Responses of Bordertown School Teachers to Faculty Questionnaire . . . 59

Appendix E. Indian Education Program Public School Contract . . . . . 61

## LIST OF TABLES


Table 1. Enrollments of Bordertown Dormitories by Grades for 1970-71 School Year, and Total Enrollments by Dormitories and Grades for 1963 and 1960 . . . . . 5

Table 2. Number of Bordertown Dormitory Students Enrolled in Grade 9 in 1966-67 and Number of Returnees Each Succeeding Year . . . . . 6

Table 3. Number of Bordertown Dormitory Students Enrolled in Grade 9 in 1967-68 and Number of Returnees Each Succeeding Year . . . . . 7

Table 4. Numbers and Kinds of Achievement Test Scores at Each Grade Level by Schools . . . . . 11

Table 5. California Achievement Test: Total Battery Composite Percentile and Grade Placement Scores by School Types . . . . . 12

Table 6. Composite Percentile Scores for Bordertown Students: Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED) and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) . . . 13

Table 7. American College Test Mean Scores by School Types . . . . . 16

Table 8. Costs of Educating Navajo Students in Bordertown and Bureau Boarding Schools . . . . 35

Table 9. Responses of Bordertown Students to Interview Guide Items . . . . . 58

Table 10. Responses of Bordertown School Teachers to Faculty Questionnaire . . . . . 60

# I. INTRODUCTION

The Bordertown Dormitory Program was initiated in 1954 as part of the Navajo Emergency Education Program. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) entered into agreements at that time with public school districts at Aztec and Gallup, New Mexico, Holbrook, Snowflake, and Winslow, Arizona, and Richfield, Utah, and later with Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Flagstaff, Arizona. Under the arrangements, school districts agreed to enroll a stipulated number of Navajo pupils, to be housed in dormitories maintained by the Bureau, and each district was granted an initial payment of $1,000 per pupil for added building costs and was guaranteed payment of full per capita tuition costs each year.

If specific objectives for the Bordertown Dormitory Program have ever been spelled out in writing, they were not discovered. However, Glenn Emmons, who was Commissioner of Indian Affairs when the program was initiated, stated in a recent conversation with the writer that the underlying goal of the program was economic, not cultural. He explained that as the Navajo Tribe had begun to take more responsibility for its affairs it constantly dealt with off-reservation companies and agencies. This brought into focus the need for more of the citizenry and leadership to be informed, experienced, and skilled in the ways and practices of the larger society, if programs and enterprises for economic and social betterment were to be successful. The Bordertown Dormitory Program was devised to help meet this need by providing some Navajo students with experiences in attending school in off-reservation communities with non-Indian children, thus giving them a sufficiently broad training to permit them to be successful on or off the reservation. Accomplishment of the above goal would seem to imply the mastery of English, adequate academic achievement, participation in school activities, and mingling with non-Indian students.

As the agreements between the Bureau and the bordertown schools approach the end of the 20-year period, the Education Committee of the Navajo Tribe and the BIA Navajo Area Office recognized the need for an evaluative survey of the Bordertown Dormitory Program, and requested the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (SWCEL) to conduct such a study.

## II. SURVEY OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

It was the intent of the survey to evaluate the Bordertown Dormitory Program in terms of the success of present and past students; adequacy of dormitory and school facilities and programs; attitudes of present students, former students, parents, school personnel, and townspeople toward the program; and comparative costs of the program and other financial considerations.

Interview guides and questionnaires were prepared and appointments made with schools and dormitories for scheduled site visits. Rosters of current enrollments were obtained from dormitories for use in selecting a random sample of students to be interviewed. Selected for interview from each school were approximately 50% of the seniors, 40% of the juniors, 25% of the sophomores, 15% of the freshmen, and 10% of the eighth grade students.

Four to six members of the team visited each community and spent two or three days at each site inspecting dormitories, visiting classes, and interviewing dormitory students, school superintendents, school principals, faculty members, non-Indian students, dormitory principals, dormitory staff personnel, school board members, and townspeople. All junior and senior high schools enrolling dormitory students were surveyed except in Albuquerque, where two junior high schools and two senior high schools were visited. Junior high schools visited numbered 12 and senior high schools 11. A total of 407 dormitory students were interviewed and 225 school teachers either gave interviews or completed questionnaires. The original intent was to interview teachers but it proved to be so difficult to schedule a time to do so that in most cases team members settled for a few minutes of conversation and then asked the teachers to complete the questionnaire and turn it in later. While at the sites, arrangements were made with dormitories to obtain information about recent graduates and with schools to supply such data on dormitory students as grades, achievement test scores, and numbers of participants in activities.

After site visits were completed some members of the team spent several weeks attempting to locate and interview bordertown graduates and parents of current bordertown students.

## III. THE BORDERTOWN DORMITORY STUDENTS

Since school achievement has been found to depend upon a child's experiences in his home and local community, as well as upon his aptitude and schooling, the team was interested in investigating such factors as place of residence, family language patterns, and education of parents.

### Student Backgrounds

Information garnered from interviews with bordertown dormitory students revealed that the homes of nearly all (94%) of them are located on the reservation. Since one of the criteria for acceptance into a bordertown dormitory is inaccessability of a public school it can be assumed that the homes of most of the bordertown dormitory students lie in relatively isolated areas of the reservation.

It also was determined from student interviews that Navajo, or Hopi in a few instances, was the language spoken in 75% of the homes. In only 9% of the homes was English the principal language used.

Only 25% of the students said that they were able to speak English when they started school and another 17% said that they could speak only some or a little English; 58% said that they were unable to speak any English.

Questions to the students about the level of schooling attained by parents revealed that 55% of the mothers and 38% of the fathers had received no schooling. The average years of school attendance was 3.1 for mothers and 4.1 for fathers. This places the average number of years of schooling for parents of bordertown students far below the 8.4 figure for all Indian adults as shown by the 1960 census.

In previous studies by SWCEL of Indian high school education,[1] data similar to the above were gathered on students enrolled in various types of schools in the Navajo area, in all of Arizona and New Mexico, and in the entire Southwest. Comparative data for bordertown dormitory students and a sample of all Indian students in the Navajo area reveal that more bordertown dormitory students come from reservation homes (94% compared to 80%), fewer parents of bordertown dormitory students

are high school graduates (6% to 9%), and fewer bordertown dormitory students spoke English when they started school (25% to 56%). More parents of bordertown students (47%) had no schooling than did parents of Indian high school students in general in Arizona and New Mexico (26%). Average years of schooling for parents of bordertown dormitory students was less than that of Indian parents in the Southwest (3.5 years and 7.1 years) and fewer were high school graduates (6% and 16%).

Considering their backgrounds, it would not have been surprising to have found these students somewhat backward and inarticulate, but the team discovered that this was not the case. Students were very friendly and responsive, and quite agreeable to being interviewed. Most of them were outgoing and confident and expressed themselves freely and well. The team rated 60% of the students interviewed as being self-assured, 30% as somewhat shy, and 10% as ill-at-ease while being interviewed. As to facility in oral English, 30% were rated excellent, 50% good, 16% fair, and only 4% as poor.

## Enrollments

The enrollments of the eight bordertown dormitories total 2,010 students. This total is somewhat less than those for 1963 and 1960 as can be seen in Table 1. The decrease is due largely to a reduction in the rated capacity of Manuelito Hall, Gallup, from 500 to 350. Also, there is a temporary under-enrollment at Albuquerque because places were held until late in the summer for students from Ramah who did not return when the new community school there was finally assured.

The trend toward heavier enrollment in the high school grades and lighter enrollment in the elementary grades can be seen in Table 1. In 1960 the greatest concentration of bordertown dormitory students was in grades 4 and 5; in 1963 it was in grades 7 and 8; at present it is in grades 9 and 10. In 1960 only 25% of the total bordertown dormitory enrollment was in the high school grades (9-12). Today, 65% of the bordertown dormitory students are enrolled in the high school grades. This trend probably is due to increased school opportunities available at the elementary level on the reservation and the desire of parents to keep younger children as close to home as possible.

## Transfers and Dropouts

A study of bordertown dormitory rosters reveals a high degree of student turnover. As can be seen in Table 2, of the 306 students enrolled in grade 9 in 1966, only 163 were still on the same dormitory

TABLE 1

Enrollments of Bordertown Dormitories by Grades
for 1970-71 School Year, and Total Enrollments
by Dormitories and Grades for 1963* and 1960*

| | Grades | | | | | | | | | | | | Totals 1970-71 | Totals 1963 | Totals 1960 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | | |
| Albuquerque | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 54 | 70 | 44 | 58 | 288 | 368 | 266 |
| Aztec | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 40 | 36 | 16 | 21 | 134 | 127 | 140 |
| Flagstaff | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 14 | 100 | 66 | 46 | 41 | 303 | 315 | 314 |
| Gallup | 0 | 5 | 24 | 31 | 44 | 40 | 38 | 32 | 35 | 37 | 35 | 29 | 350 | 539 | 559 |
| Holbrook | 1 | 7 | 8 | 19 | 31 | 39 | 57 | 46 | 82 | 62 | 34 | 42 | 428 | 420 | 428 |
| Richfield | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 37 | 31 | 23 | 9 | 123 | 125 | 127 |
| Snowflake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 32 | 37 | 29 | 123 | 118 | 126 |
| Winslow | 0 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 28 | 58 | 43 | 26 | 22 | 261 | 288 | 324 |
| Totals, 1970-71 | 1 | 15 | 46 | 81 | 114 | 127 | 150 | 156 | 431 | 377 | 261 | 251 | 2010 | | |
| Totals, 1963* | 41 | 64 | 113 | 185 | 258 | 272 | 354 | 320 | 228 | 171 | 155 | 139 | | 2300 | |
| Totals, 1960* | 64 | 119 | 217 | 312 | 322 | 261 | 195 | 216 | 214 | 190 | 120 | 54 | | | 2284 |

*1963 and 1960 enrollment figures from Sophie Aberle, Preliminary Survey of Some Peripheral Dormitories, 1964, pp. 18-26.

TABLE 2

Number of Bordertown Dormitory Students
Enrolled in Grade 9 in 1966-67
and Number of Returnees Each Succeeding Year

| | Enrollment 9th grade 1966-67 | Returnees 10th grade 1967-68 | Returnees 11th grade 1968-69 | Returnees 12th grade 1969-70 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Albuquerque | 59 | 50 | 41 | 31 |
| Aztec | 27 | 19 | 14 | 14 |
| Flagstaff | 43 | 31 | 25 | 21 |
| Gallup | 54 | 42 | 26 | 23 |
| Holbrook | 41 | 39 | 30 | 23 |
| Richfield | 22 | 18 | 16 | 10 |
| Snowflake | 21 | 19 | 16 | 16 |
| Winslow | 39 | 35 | 31 | 25 |
| Totals: | 306 | 253 | 199 | 163 |

TABLE 3

Number of Bordertown Dormitory Students
Enrolled in Grade 9 in 1967-68
and Number of Returnees Each Succeeding Year

| | Enrollment 9th grade 1967-68 | Returnees 10th grade 1968-69 | Returnees 11th grade 1969-70 | Returnees 12th grade 1970-71 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Albuquerque | 74 | 55 | 41 | 28 |
| Aztec | 32 | 22 | 14 | 13 |
| Flagstaff | 71 | 38 | 27 | 22 |
| Gallup | 46 | 31 | 23 | 19 |
| Holbrook | 74 | 61 | 50 | 37 |
| Richfield | 18 | 9 | 5 | 3 |
| Snowflake | 33 | 26 | 22 | 18 |
| Winslow | 23 | 19 | 17 | 12 |
| Totals: | 371 | 261 | 199 | 152 |

rosters as 12th grade students in 1969. This is a loss of 47%. Of the 371 students enrolled in grade 9 in 1967 only 152 continued in the same dormitory to enter grade 12 in 1970, a loss of 56%. No effort was made to trace those students who withdrew, but it is assumed that most of them transferred to other high schools and continued their education.

While it was beyond the scope of this study to determine dropout rates for bordertown students, it was possible to extract some pertinent figures from data gathered in a study, completed by SWCEL in 1969, of dropout of Indian high school students in the Southwest.[2] In that study, a random sample drawn from all types of schools was traced, in spite of transfers or temporary withdrawals, from enrollment in grade 8 in 1962 to actual dropout, decease, or graduation from high school. Included in the sample were 127 students enrolled in the Albuquerque, Aztec, Flagstaff, Gallup, Holbrook, Snowflake, and Winslow schools. The only bordertown school not included in the study, because it was out of the study boundaries, was Richfield.

Of the sample of 127 Indian students enrolled in grade 8 in bordertown schools in 1962, 95 went on to complete their high school education and 35 dropped out. This places the dropout rate at 27.5%. This rate is lower than the 38.7% rate established for Indian students in the Southwest, or the rates of 33.9% and 34.7% for Indian students in New Mexico and Arizona. It also is slightly lower than the rate of 28.6% found for Navajo students enrolled in all types of schools.

Since a large majority of those in the bordertown school sample were dormitory students, it is safe to say that the dropout rate for bordertown dormitory students is somewhat lower, or at least comparable, to the dropout rate for all Navajo students and decidedly lower than the dropout rates for Indian students of all tribes in the Southwest or the states of Arizona and New Mexico.

## IV. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

School achievement of students in the bordertown dormitory program can be assessed in several ways. Comparisons can be made with students in the nation as a whole, with other students in the bordertown schools, and with Navajo students enrolled in other types of schools. An attempt was made to gather data from various sources that would be useful in making these kinds of assessments.

Records at some bordertown schools yielded scores for dormitory students on the Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED) and the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT). Fortunately, data from the California Achievement Test (CAT) were on hand for a random sample of students enrolled in BIA schools, reservation public schools, and one bordertown school, having been gathered in another study being conducted by SWCEL. From tribal and BIA files it was possible to obtain American College Test scores for some of the students making application for financial assistance for entrance into college as freshmen in 1970. Also obtained from some bordertown school records were grade point averages and class ranks for recent dormitory graduates.

### Grades and Class Ranks

Grade point averages for 85 bordertown dormitory students who graduated last spring (1970) from Aztec, Flagstaff, Holbrook, Richfield, Snowflake, South Sevier, and Winslow High Schools indicate that their grades were slightly below average. Based on a four-point scale, in which four is the highest grade (A) and one is the lowest passing grade (D), the graduates had a composite grade point average of 2.0. This is exactly equivalent to a letter grade average of C.

When the class rankings of 103 recent dormitory graduates from Aztec, Flagstaff, Holbrook, Snowflake, South Sevier, and Winslow High Schools were examined, it was found that the highest standing attained by a dormitory student in a bordertown school was a ranking of 17th in a class numbering 112 graduates. Four dormitory graduates ranked in the upper one-fourth of their graduating classes, 23 were in the second quartile, 47 in the third quartile, and 29 in the lowest quartile. This places 70 of the 103 dormitory graduates, or 68% of them, in the middle one-half of their graduating classes.

The above findings tend to confirm what seemed to be the consensus of the opinions of school principals, counselors, teachers, and the dormitory students themselves. School people observed that the academic achievement of dormitory students is somewhat lower on the average than that of other students, with very few in the highest group, but also with no more than the normal number in the low group and very few in danger of failing. Of the dormitory students interviewed, 16% said that their grades were lower than those of non-Indian students and 8% said that their grades were higher.

## Achievement Test Results

In assessing achievement of bordertown dormitory students, as measured by standardized tests, scores at the 10th, 11th, and 12th grade levels were used only for students who also had scores at the 9th grade level. This makes possible some assessment of academic progress from grade 9 to each succeeding grade level based upon achievement test scores made by the same students.

Table 4 indicates the kinds of achievement tests and the schools from which scores were available and shows the numbers of scores for grade 9 and each succeeding grade. For example, California Achievement Test scores were available at the 9th grade level on 34 Gallup bordertown dormitory students and on the same 34 students at the 10th grade level. Also at Gallup, scores were available at the 9th grade level on 29 students who also had scores at the 11th grade level. There were nine Gallup students who had scores at both the 9th and 12th grade levels.

Table 5 presents California Achievement Test (CAT) composite percentile and grade placement scores at each grade level for the three types of schools. These scores were determined by first computing total battery mean raw scores and then converting them to percentile and grade placement scores.

Table 6 presents composite percentile scores for bordertown dormitory students on the Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED) and the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT). ITED percentile scores were determined from mean composite standard scores. SAT percentile scores were based upon mean standard scores of the English, numerical competence, and mathematics portions of that test. Grade placement scores are not available on the ITED and SAT.

An examination of percentile scores in Tables 5 and 6 reveals that at the 9th grade level mean scores range from the 30th percentile to the 18th percentile and in general become lower at each succeeding grade level. Since the national norm for each grade can be considered

TABLE 4

Numbers and Kinds of Achievement Test Scores
At Each Grade Level by Schools

| | N | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 | Grade 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST: | | | | | |
| Bordertown | | | | | |
| Gallup | 34 | x | x | | |
| Gallup | 29 | x | | x | |
| Gallup | 9 | x | | | x |
| Reservation Public | | | | | |
| Chinle | 71 | x | x | | |
| Chinle | 62 | x | | x | |
| Chinle | 10 | x | | | x |
| Window Rock | 5 | x | x | | |
| Window Rock | 10 | x | | x | |
| Window Rock | 5 | x | | | x |
| BIA | | | | | |
| Intermountain | 37 | x | x | | |
| Intermountain | 45 | x | | x | |
| Intermountain | 18 | x | | | x |
| Phoenix | 15 | x | x | | |
| Phoenix | 15 | x | | x | |
| Phoenix | 6 | x | | | x |
| Wingate | 83 | x | x | | |
| Wingate | 82 | x | | x | |
| Wingate | 74 | x | | | x |
| IOWA TEST OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: | | | | | |
| Bordertown | | | | | |
| Albuquerque | 29 | x | | x | |
| Aztec | 29 | x | x | | |
| Holbrook | 17 | x | | x | |
| STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT: | | | | | |
| Bordertown | | | | | |
| Snowflake | 17 | x | | | x |

TABLE 5

California Achievement Test
Total Battery Composite Percentile and Grade Placement Scores
By School Types

| | N | Grade 9 | | Grade 10 | | GP Gain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pct | GP | Pct | GP | |
| Bordertown Dorm. | 34 | 30 | 8.1 | 24 | 9.1 | 1.0 |
| Reservation Public | 76 | 24 | 7.8 | 14 | 8.3 | .5 |
| BIA Boarding | 135 | 21 | 7.6 | 16 | 8.5 | .9 |

| | N | Grade 9 | | Grade 11 | | GP Gain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pct | GP | Pct | GP | |
| Bordertown Dorm. | 29 | 27 | 8.0 | 16 | 9.4 | 1.4 |
| Reservation Public | 72 | 24 | 7.9 | 10 | 8.8 | .9 |
| BIA Boarding | 142 | 21 | 7.6 | 8 | 8.5 | .9 |

| | N | Grade 9 | | Grade 12 | | GP Gain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pct | GP | Pct | GP | |
| Bordertown Dorm. | 9 | 30 | 8.1 | 7 | 9.4 | 1.3 |
| Reservation Public | 15 | 21 | 7.6 | 5 | 9.1 | 1.5 |
| BIA Boarding | 98 | 21 | 7.6 | 4 | 8.8 | 1.2 |

TABLE 6

Composite Percentile Scores for Bordertown Students
Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED)
and
Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)

| | N | Grade 9 Pct | Grade 10 Pct | Grade 11 Pct | Grade 12 Pct |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ITED | 29 | 23 | 18 | | |
| ITED | 46 | 26 | | 18 | |
| SAT | 17 | 18 | | | 18 |

to be about the 50th percentile it is evident that the academic achievement of Navajo high school students is low by comparison with high school students in the nation as a whole. In evaluating achievement test results it should be kept in mind that such tests are designed for students with vastly different language and experience backgrounds than those of Navajo students from isolated areas of the reservation. And yet, it also should be borne in mind that such instruments do test educational achievements that are commonly expected of students in school and are the best objective measures we have of assessing cognitive educational development.

Bordertown dormitory students scored slightly higher at the 9th grade level than did students in reservation public and BIA boarding schools. They also made greater gains as they progressed through high school. As can be seen in Table 5, grade placement gains for bordertown students exceeded those of reservation public and BIA schools between grades 9 and 10, and also between grades 9 and 11. Although gains between grades 9 and 12 do not seem to be consistent with those of the other intervals it should be noted that the sample of bordertown students for this interval is too small to provide a measure in which much confidence can be placed. However, it is interesting to note the percentile figures in Table 6 for the same grade 9 to 12 interval. Here 17 students maintained the same percentile level on the Stanford Achievement Test at grade 12 that they had achieved at grade 9. This means that they made approximately normal progress, which would be roughly equivalent to a grade placement gain of three. If the academic progress of these 17 students is considered along with that of the nine students in Table 5, it can be seen that the achievement gain made by bordertown students between grades 9 and 12 appears to be much greater than that recorded in Table 5.

The ITED percentile scores found in Table 6 tend to confirm the observation, based upon CAT scores in Table 5, that bordertown dormitory students appear to make somewhat greater academic gains as they progress through high school than do students in the other types of schools.

American College Test scores were obtained from the folders of 125 students who had applied to the Navajo Tribe and of 146 students who had applied to the Bureau of Indian Affairs Navajo Area Office for financial assistance to enter college as freshmen in 1970. Mean scores were computed for bordertown dormitory, BIA reservation, BIA off-reservation, reservation public, public off-reservation, and mission school graduates. However, since many graduates apparently did not take the test and the sample is not a random one the mean scores are of questionable value as a basis for comparison of academic

achievement of students in the different types of schools. Apparently a large proportion of bordertown dormitory and public off-reservation students took the ACT but a somewhat smaller proportion of reservation public students and very few BIA students did so. Since better students are most likely to take the test it is obvious that data are greatly biased when most students in one group voluntarily take the test and only a few in another group do so.

Numbers of ACT scores available for each type of school and mean scores are shown in Table 7. As can be seen, the order of rank from high to low for school types was reservation public, public off-reservation, mission, off-reservation BIA, bordertown dormitory, and reservation BIA.

At one time the Navajo Tribal Council had the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT) given to all 12th grade Navajo students. Scores were used as a basis for offering tribal scholarships. An earlier study of the Bordertown Dormitory Program points out that in the 1963-64 school year DATs were administered to 1,050 high school seniors in various kinds of schools.[3] At that time, based upon mean scores, the different student groups ranked from highest to lowest as follows: mission, bordertown, off-reservation BIA boarding, reservation public.

TABLE 7

American College Test
Mean Scores by School Types

| | N | Mean Score |
|---|---|---|
| Reservation Public | 62 | 14.91 |
| Off-Reservation Public | 127 | 14.74 |
| Mission | 36 | 14.33 |
| Off-Reservation BIA | 48 | 13.14 |
| Bordertown Dormitory | 84 | 13.02 |
| Reservation BIA | 14 | 12.71 |
| Total: | 371 | |

## V. THE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

In general, the evaluation team was well impressed with buildings, equipment, materials, and breadth and quality of course offerings and activities found at the schools being attended by bordertown dormitory students. A favorable feature of the bordertown program is that students are attending schools where there are excellent facilities, well-qualified teachers, high scholastic standards, and a broad spectrum of curricular and extracurricular offerings from which to choose.

### Curricula

A number of the schools have outstanding facilities for vocational-technical education and offer a wide selection of courses, such as auto mechanics, auto body repair, carpentry, welding, food handling, electronics, drafting, and practical nursing. Many dormitory students were enrolled in these courses, as well as in business education and home economics courses, which are offered by all of the bordertown high schools. Some dormitory students were participating in distributive education programs.

Schools were attempting in various ways to meet the needs of certain of their students having serious deficiencies in reading and English. Most were offering special English courses, variously called Basic English, Remedial Reading, Special English, or, as in one school, Developmental Reading and Vocabulary Building. It was noted that dormitory students were not being segregated into special English classes, and in most schools they were not enrolled in these classes in disproportionate numbers. Of the 250 freshmen in one high school, 58 were enrolled in Basic English, but only a few of these were Indian students. In another high school, no dormitory student was enrolled in the remedial English classes. Some schools, rather than having special English classes, were attempting to meet the needs of all students through the regular English classes by employing ungraded or multi-track programs. In a few schools, selected students were receiving small group instruction in English and reading in addition to their regular English classes. In several other schools, principals expressed a need for such supplementary English instruction but regretted that the unavailability of the necessary special teachers made it impossible.

Almost entirely absent from the instructional programs were courses in Indian history, culture, and language. Of the 11 high schools and 12 junior high schools surveyed, only one high school and one junior high school offered such a course. The one high school offered three sections of a Navajo language course and the one junior high school had a class in Navajo culture, history, and language. Another high school offers a cultural humanities course in which several cultures, including American Indian, are examined. One high school incorporates a unit on Indian history into one of its history courses and another includes a unit on cultural awareness in its social studies program. In one of the junior high schools, a teacher of Spanish can speak some Navajo and includes some instruction in that language in the course. In all, two schools were offering special Indian studies courses, four were incorporating some units on Indian culture, history, or language into other courses, and 17 were without such courses or units.

## Counseling

In interviews with guidance counselors at bordertown schools, about one half of them stated that they did not have sufficient time to adequately counsel Indian students. In several other schools it was found that counselors were carrying loads of from 400 to 500 students and they also obviously could not meet the guidance needs of their Indian students. Most counselors seemed to be very much interested in the Indian students and probably were giving a disproportionate amount of their time and attention to them. Counselors were in agreement that it took more time to counsel Indian students because more paper work is required for them and because of greater difficulty in establishing rapport, getting them to come in, and eliciting responses. No Indian counselors were encountered in the schools visited.

## General Observations

It was the observation of the evaluation team that dormitory students tended to segregate themselves somewhat from other students. This was very evident in the cafeterias and in some classes. However, in most classrooms dormitory students were seated among other students, but some of this mixed seating was due to assignment of seats by teachers. Dormitory students did mingle considerably with non-Indian students in halls and recreation areas. The team also observed that Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and certain types of Anglos tended to cluster together in small groups in the classrooms, halls, cafeterias, and play areas.

The responses of teachers to an item on a questionnaire as to how much dormitory students mixed with other students tended to confirm the observations of the team. Although a few teachers (10%) thought that dormitory students mixed a lot and 30% felt that they mixed quite well, a majority (60%) said that they mixed very little.

Dormitory students were observed to be responsive and to express themselves quite well in English when called upon to recite, but rarely did they volunteer to recite or enter into class discussions. They were well-behaved and attentive and seemed to be interested in their school work. They also seemed to be happy and at ease in their school settings. Again, teacher opinions tend to confirm the observations of the team. A majority (70%) noted that dormitory students do not recite as much as other students, but about the same number rated the facility of the students in oral English from excellent to fair. About 30% indicated that most dormitory students are seriously handicapped in English.

## Participation in School Activities

According to statistics that were available from seven bordertown high schools, dormitory students are participating in extracurricular activities quite well, but to a slightly lesser degree than other students. Dormitory students comprised 18% of the school enrollments and accounted for 15% of the participants in the various activities.

The opinions that school principals expressed in interviews did not agree with this finding. About 60% thought that dormitory students were participating in activities as much or more than other students. However, it was noted that some principals mentioned how well dormitory students attended various activities, especially athletic events, and they probably were including spectator participation in their estimates.

Participation was heaviest in athletics. Of the schools that reported having cross country teams, a majority of the participants were dormitory students. Participation was also high in basketball, wrestling, and track, but only about average in baseball and football. The only non-athletic activity in which participation was above average was chorus. Very few dormitory students were band members, probably because of the prohibitive costs of instruments and because of lack of practice facilities at the dormitories.

Membership of dormitory students on school newspaper and annual staffs was about proportionate to their numbers in the student bodies. Their skills in art were in particular demand for work on these publications.

Participation in FFA, FTA, and FHA clubs was quite good, although slightly below the levels of other students. Membership was low in pep clubs, science clubs, mathematics clubs, and Spanish clubs. Participation was almost nil in such activities as student council, cheerleading, drama, forensics, and school dances. One school has a dance teacher going to the dormitory to provide instruction to interested students. A few schools have Indian clubs.

From student interviews it was found that 36% of the students did not participate in any extracurricular school activity. Another 33% participated in only one activity. The remaining 31%, who were in two or more activities, actually accounted for 70% of the participation of the dormitory students in school activities.

Limited finances probably prevent some students from participating in certain activities. In answer to a question as to whether or not having enough money to take part in activities was a problem, 45% said that it was.

## Opinions of Dormitory Students

Student interviews revealed that dormitory students hold very favorable opinions of the schools they are attending. Not only did 95% indicate that they liked their school, but many expressed very strong positive opinions such as "the school is just great," or "I like everything about the school," or "I am very satisfied with the school." There were, of course, some criticisms voiced by students concerning the schools, but 80% of them had no complaints or suggestions for changes. Of the criticisms made, the greatest number had to do with teachers who did not seem to like Navajos or went too fast in class and did not explain things clearly enough.

About 80% of the dormitory students thought that teachers were just as interested in them as in the other students in the school, and a few stated that teachers showed more interest in them. But a significant number, 20%, thought that teachers definitely favored the white students.

It is interesting that when teachers were asked if they thought that teachers in general were as interested in dormitory students as in other students, 5% answered in the negative, 90% in the affirmative, and 5% professed that they did not know.

The next most frequent complaints voiced by dormitory students were of the quality and quantity of food served in the school cafeterias and of the attitudes and behavior of some non-Indian students toward

them. On the latter point, however, 90% of the dormitory students indicated that they felt that they were well accepted by the other students in the school and 97% said that they had student friends outside of the dormitory. Teachers' opinions supported the students' feelings about acceptance in that about 90% of the teachers indicated that it was their observation that dormitory students were well accepted and liked by other students.

A suggestion made by some students was that they would like to have Navajo history, culture, and language classes established in the curriculum.

Dormitory students were very strong in their opinion that they were getting a good education. In fact, 90% of them thought that the education they were receiving was better than they would get in a BIA boarding school and 56% thought that it was better than in a reservation public school. When asked "Why?" the reason most frequently given was that they went to school with non-Indians. Other reasons very often mentioned were that scholastic standards were high, they had to talk English most of the time, they learned more, and they had good teachers.

When asked if they expected to graduate from high school, 99% said that they were confident that they would. After graduation, 58% expected to go to college, 16% to vocational/technical school, 10% to work or into the military service, and 16% were uncertain of their plans.

Opinions of Teachers

Teachers generally were very favorably inclined toward the bordertown dormitory program.

About 80% of the teachers questioned were of the opinion that having the dormitory students in school was beneficial to the other students and the school. The reason most often mentioned for holding this view was that the presence of the dormitory students helped other students to learn to respect, appreciate, and get along with those of another race and cultural background. Of the 20% who dissented, most were uncertain or ambivalent about the value of having the bordertown students and only a few were definitely opposed. Some teachers expressed concern about the large proportion of minority students now enrolled in their schools and apparently feared that academic standards were, or would be, declining.

Not all teachers were certain, either, that the bordertown program was good for the Indian students. About three-fourths of the teachers

thought that it was good, but a minority of about one-fourth definitely thought otherwise or had some serious doubts. Some reasons offered for holding the negative view were that dormitory students were losing too much of their culture, that they should not have to be so far removed from home and parents, that the schools were geared to non-Indian students and could not meet the needs of the dormitory students, and that dormitory conditions were poor.

Teachers rated the academic potentialities of dormitory students on a par with those of other students. When asked what percent of the dormitory students they thought were capable of graduating from high school they estimated that 88% could. When asked the same question for non-Indians they estimated 89%. Similar estimates for capability to graduate from college were 47% for dormitory students and 46% for other students.

When asked whether they favored continuation of the bordertown program 84% responded in the affirmative. Of the remaining 16% only a few answered in the negative and the others were ambivalent.

Only 17% of the teachers had received any special training for teaching Indian students, but, significantly, 85% indicated that they considered such training to be important. In fact, when teachers were asked what suggestions they had for making the education program more effective for bordertown students the response most frequently offered was that teachers should have cultural awareness training by means of orientation and inservice sessions, or possibly through seminars or workshops.

The next most frequent suggestion for improving the educational program was that means should be devised to help dormitory students improve their English and reading skills. Other suggestions made by many teachers were that ways needed to be found to involve dormitory students in more school and community activities, that the quality of life in the dormitories ought to be improved, that dormitory students should be present on the first day of school in the fall and should not take extended vacations, and that there needs to be more contact, communication, and cooperation between dormitory staff and teachers.

Further suggestions, each coming from a number of teachers, were that faculties should include some Navajo teachers and counselors, that tutoring programs should be expanded and improved, that a special orientation program should be given to new dormitory students by the school at the beginning of each school year, that there should be a more careful selection of students for the bordertown program, that better transportation should be provided so that dormitory students

are not so hampered in participating in school activities, that classes on Navajo language, culture, and history should be included in the curriculum, and that more funds should be provided for supplies for dormitory students, such as for instruments for band, gear for athletics, and materials for shop and home economics.

## Views of School Administrators

Many of the same questions that were asked of teachers were also asked of school principals and superintendents, and on these questions their responses were in general agreement with those of teachers.

All of the superintendents and a large majority of the principals were very positive in their opinions that the bordertown program has been successful for the Indian student. Many noted that in spite of a lingering tendency to keep aloof and not participate in certain activities there has been great progress in social adjustment and academic achievement in recent years. A few principals, however, had mixed emotions about the value of the program for the Indian students.

A majority of the superintendents and principals also were of the opinion that having the dormitory students was good for the other students and the school. In three districts, however, which have many other Indian students, the administrators agreed that having the dormitory students had little effect upon the other students or the school. Two of these superintendents said that they and their boards would not like to exceed the present proportion of Indian students in their high schools, which in one case is 30% and in the other, 33%, and, therefore, would not want to take more dormitory students at the secondary level. However, all other superintendents indicated that no limitation has been placed on numbers of bordertown students and several favored increasing and possibly doubling the numbers.

As to the selection of students for the bordertown program, a majority of the administrators were pretty well satisfied with the quality of students coming into their schools. About one-fourth of them thought that there should be a somewhat more careful selection; and one principal expressed some dissatisfaction because some students who had siblings there and wanted to attend, and whose parents were favorable, were influenced by BIA personnel to go to BIA schools.

All principals favored continuing the bordertown program, and many were quite emphatic about it. Superintendents also approved of extending the program, but some added certain qualifications to their approval. One was not certain that his board would favor a continuation because of the increasing enrollment of minority students in the

high school. Besides the high school enrollment limitation problem, financial considerations were mentioned by most superintendents as being a determining factor in whether or not their boards would favor continuing the program.

Observations by Some Non-Indian Students

Team members made it a point to talk to some non-Indian students at various bordertown schools. In several instances a principal or a counselor arranged for some team members to talk with a group of students.

Non-Indian students generally agreed that there are few close friendships between them and dormitory students, that they seldom date each other, but that they like each other and often converse with one another. They observed that most dormitory students are somewhat reserved, not outgoing and aggressive, and tend to stay together and not mingle. However, when they are thrown together with dormitory students in some activity they get along together very well. They also thought that dormitory students are as capable as other students, but have some problems, or lack confidence, in English, and only a few voluntarily contribute to class discussions.

Non-Indian students also observed that dormitory students seldom attend social functions such as dances. A number stated that they would like to visit the dormitory and socialize with bordertown students and would do so if functions were planned for this purpose and they were extended personal invitations so that they really felt welcome. They expressed themselves as feeling that they have benefitted by having the bordertown students in school and that the bordertown students have benefitted also.

Community Attitudes

In order to sample community attitudes toward the Bordertown Dormitory Program, interviews were conducted with various townspeople, including school board members, doctors, dentists, lawyers, bankers, mayors, and merchants. Almost without exception they were strongly in favor of the program, and thought that people in the community were glad to have the dormitory students in the schools and would like to see the program continued. Two interviewees stated that the presence of the dormitory students had greatly changed and improved the attitudes of the people of the community toward Indians.

All who were interviewed were of the opinion that dormitory students are well accepted by other students, have adapted well to

the schools, and are receiving a superior education and making the kind of social adjustment that will be of great value to them in the future. The majority also thought that the presence of the dormitory students has been very beneficial to other students.

Several school board members, although in favor of continuing the program, voiced some concerns. One stated that enrollment is increasing, buildings are getting old and crowded, and if the Bureau continues to send more students at the secondary level some federal funds will be needed for new buildings and equipment. Another board member, also noting the trend toward accepting greater numbers of dormitory students at the secondary level, felt that the present ratio of Indian students to others in the high school should be maintained. Still another, though very supportive of the program, was concerned about the financial changes being suggested by the Bureau and the state and was not certain that the district would be able to afford to keep the program.

Only one of the townspeople interviewed, a school board member, was negative about continuing the program. He felt that selection of students had been poor in recent years and that too few of the better students were being sent to the bordertown program and too many were being sent who should not be accepted. He mentioned that records of new students usually did not arrive for a month or more after the student was enrolled, and then it was hard to refuse to keep a student. He also pointed out that the schools in his community have many Indian students other than dormitory students, and with minority students now about equal in numbers to Anglo students, he feels that the academic standards of the schools are being jeopardized. In his opinion, only a financially attractive agreement which would provide a capital outlay for buildings and equipment would persuade the board to continue the program.

In one community an interviewee was very favorable toward the Bordertown Dormitory Program in general and very complimentary toward students and most staff, but was very critical of the dormitory principal. In another community, a team member, hearing of a merchant who would not let Indian students come into his store, went to talk with him. Apparently there had been some shoplifting, and also some accusations that dormitory students had been obtaining liquor there. It was difficult to determine whether prejudice against Indians or a desire to avoid trouble, or both, prompted the ban.

After the team visitation in one community, four service clubs wrote letters to appropriate BIA agency officials strongly recommending continuation of the bordertown program in that community.

## VI. THE DORMITORIES

The team visited each dormitory and spent much time observing, and talking to students and staff.

### Student Comments

When students were asked "Do you like it here?" a majority replied that they liked the school but not the dormitory. When asked if there were things about the school or dormitory that they disliked, only 15% had criticisms of their school, but 60% offered criticisms of the dormitory. There were seven times as many criticisms made of the dormitory as of the school. Since students spend only about one-fourth of their waking hours in school and are kept busy there in a highly structured situation, while they live and spend their free time in the dormitory, it could be expected that there would be more complaints about the dormitory. However, the great discrepancy seems excessive.

Based both upon percentages of interviewees who voiced complaints and upon average numbers of complaints per interviewee, students seemed to be happiest at the Aztec, Albuquerque, Holbrook, and Snowflake dormitories, and less contented at Flagstaff, Gallup, Richfield, and Winslow. Students in the dormitory in which the greatest dissatisfaction seemed to exist registered six times as many complaints per interviewee as did those in the dormitory where students seemed to be most contented.

In order of frequency the major complaints were of buildings, rules, staff, food, and activities.

Students complained that dormitory buildings are old, run-down, small, crowded, cold, noisy, and afford no privacy. They said that individual rooms and better study and recreation facilities are needed. There also were many complaints about the dormitories being located too far from the schools. This was mentioned most frequently at Winslow where students walk 12 blocks to school, often in inclement weather, and must walk back to the dormitory at noon for lunch.

A common complaint was that there were too many rules and regulations, many of which placed unreasonable restrictions on students. Examples frequently cited were a rule forbidding students to chew gum in the dormitory and the strict dress code.

Criticisms by students of staff were that many had a negative attitude, were not interested in students, and would not listen to them. Students complained that they had no one to whom they felt they could go when they had a problem.

Criticisms specifically of instructional aides were that some are unreasonable, unfair, harsh, and incapable of helping students with schoolwork or personal problems. It was suggested by some students that younger aides are needed, rather than so many older people who do not understand teenagers.

Students criticized the food because they did not get enough to eat, the food was sometimes not very good, and there was not enough variety from day to day.

A constantly recurring complaint was the lack of activities, especially on weekends. Some said that they would like more Indian food, and some complained about being seated in alternate boy-girl order in the dining hall.

About one-fourth of the students said that having adequate clothing was a problem for them. Slightly more than one-half indicated that they were not receiving tribal clothing, most of them presumably because they were over the age limit. There were some who volunteered the opinion that students should be eligible to receive tribal clothing until they complete high school, regardless of age. About 70% of those who were recent recipients of tribal clothing expressed satisfaction with what they had received. The most frequent complaint coming from the 30% who expressed dissatisfaction was that the clothing was old-fashioned and out of style. Other criticisms were that it was too uniform and that it was the wrong size.

## Responses of Dormitory Principals and Staff Members

Information and opinions obtained in interviews with dormitory principals and staff members tended to lend credence to some of the complaints of students. Most principals considered buildings to be inadequate, pointing to the need for rooms, rather than barracks, for older students. Several said that they need gymnasiums and all need more recreation and activity space and equipment. Also needed are adequate libraries with sufficient reference materials. Building

maintenance was often mentioned by principals and staff members as being a constant problem.

Principals cited many staffing inadequacies, both in quantity and quality. A majority thought that staff positions needed to be upgraded in order to more nearly meet the needs of bordertown students and that more staff members were needed, especially, trained recreation directors and fully qualified counselors.

In addition to the limitations of facilities and staff, most dormitory principals also felt that funding for the bordertown program was quite limited. With all of these limitations they thought that it was difficult, if not impossible, to operate the kind of program the students need. Many also were of the opinion that the bordertown dormitories are regarded as somewhat of a "step-child" by the BIA and, because they are only dormitories, are neglected in favor of the Bureau's fully academic institutions.

Staff members, too, frequently mentioned the need for a recreation director, more recreation and activity space and equipment, better library facilities, and a better guidance and counseling program. Some also indicated a need for more cleaning supplies and equipment, increased laundry facilities, new kitchen equipment, additional food storage space, and more food. It was suggested by some that more leadership is needed and that better relationships should be established between staff and administration.

## Team Observations of Dormitories

Team inspection of buildings and grounds led to much the same conclusions about dormitory facilities as those voiced by principals, staff members, and students. Buildings appeared to have been constructed more for elementary than for high school students. Sleeping and living quarters were of the barracks type, except at Albuquerque, and were crowded. Library facilities were lacking or inadequate, sanitation facilities were somewhat substandard, lounges had to double as rumpus rooms, and there was a lack of counseling or meeting rooms. Housekeeping was good and most dormitories had been made quite attractive, but maintenance was poor in many cases. Food storage space and refrigeration capacity were insufficient in many kitchens. Playground facilities and equipment were inadequate at some sites. The most undesirable and poorest maintained building was Manuelito Hall at Gallup. This building is the only one of the bordertown dormitories not owned by the Bureau, and the owners do not keep the building in good repair.

## VII. EVALUATIONS BY PARENTS AND GRADUATES

### Opinions of Parents

Interviews were held with 42 parents having children in bordertown dormitories. These 42 families had a total of 193 children attending schools at the elementary and secondary levels, of which 59 were in bordertown schools. Of their other children of school age, mostly younger, a majority were in Bureau schools, some were in public schools, and a few were in mission schools or in the Latter Day Saints home placement program.

Parents' responses were favorable toward the bordertown program. All except three parents said that they had been given a choice in the enrollment of their children in the bordertown program, and these three expressed satisfaction with the placement of their children. When asked what kind of school they thought was providing the best education, 52% of the parents indicated bordertown, public, or a school in which non-Indian students are in the majority. Since most of these parents can only send their children to a public or highly integrated school by having them in a bordertown dormitory, it is apparent that they were equating public and integrated with bordertown. A few parents commented that they wished that they were able to have their children in a public school, like a bordertown school, and could keep them at home. About 20% either thought that all types of schools were good or did not feel that they knew enough about schools to make a judgement about what kind is best. When parents having younger, preschool children were asked where they would like them to attend school, about 50% indicated a preference for bordertown schools. About 33% favored Bureau schools, but some of these indicated that they would like to start their children in Bureau schools and enroll them in bordertown schools later.

When asked if they thought that the bordertown program should be continued, 40 of the 42 parents answered in the affirmative. Three of these qualified their affirmative responses with the condition that the dormitory situation be improved, and another made the stipulation that the BIA should support the program better. One parent said that the bordertown program should not be continued if enough public schools

are built on the reservation, and one indicated uncertainty about continuation.

When queried as to what they thought was good about the bordertown program, the responses most frequently voiced were that going to school with non-Indians was good, that students were getting a better education, that English was being learned better, and that there was more competition.

In response to a question about what things they disliked in the bordertown program there were no complaints about the schools, but 52% of the parents had one or more criticisms of the dormitories. Some of the criticisms were that dormitory facilities were inadequate, that there should be more staff who understand teenagers and are interested in students, that better transportation between dormitory and school should be provided, that there is too much drinking by students, and that there should be more recreation available to students. It should be pointed out that the number of criticisms made was not large--only a total of 34 for 42 interviewees--and that in no instance was the same criticism made by more than four people.

In addition to information gathered from parent interviews, minutes were made available of a recent meeting of the Winslow Dormitory Parents Club (Hopi). This meeting was held at the Winslow Dormitory for the purpose of inspecting the dormitory and reviewing its program. Appreciation was expressed for the opportunity of having their children in the Winslow public school, but many criticisms of the dormitory were listed. The group noted serious deficiencies in living quarters, laundry facilities, transportation, staffing, recreation, counseling, tutoring, library facilities, and playgrounds.

About one-half of the parents said that they visited their children either every week or every other week. Most of the others said that they saw their children only at vacation times, and some said that they visited their children about once a month. A large majority indicated that they felt welcome when they visited the dormitory. Nearly 50% stated that they received no communications from the dormitory, while 45% said that they sometimes received a letter about vacations or some special event.

Of the 42 parents, only 11 had visited the school their child attended, and four of these had not talked to any school personnel. Most of those who had visited the school had talked to the principal and a few had talked with at least one of the student's teachers.

These 42 parents were able to provide information on 38 of their other children who were older and had graduates from high school. Twelve of these 38 graduates were from bordertown dormitories, and of these 12, six were attending college, one was taking vocational training, and the others were working or were in the service. Sixteen had graduated from BIA schools. Of these, two were in college, one was enrolled in a vocational school, two were unemployed, one was a housewife, and the others were working or were in the service. Of the nine who were graduates of public schools, two were attending college, one was unemployed, and the others were working. There were two graduates of mission schools and both were enrolled in college.

## Responses of Graduates of 1962

In a study of Indian high school graduates in the Southwest, completed by SWCEL two years ago, the random sample of 384 graduates in Spring 1962 from all types of schools included 14 bordertown dormitory graduates. The evaluation team for the present study recently interviewed 10 additional graduates of 1962, bringing the total to 24. This represents an estimated 20-25% of the bordertown high school graduates of 1962.

At the time of interview all of the 24 graduates were employed and listed the following occupations: engineer (1), teacher (1), clergyman (1), electrician (1), teacher aide (1), draftsman (2), clerk (5), instructional aide (6), housepainter (1), construction trainee (1), housewife (2), seamstress (1), secretary (1).

Of the 24 graduates, 19, or 79%, had continued their education beyond high school. A total of 10, representing 42%, had attended college, and 2, or 8%, had completed college; 45% had completed a vocational training program. Some had received both college and vocational training. The above figures are substantially higher than those for all Indian high school graduates of 1962 in Arizona, where 70% continued their education, 18% enrolled in college, and 3% completed college, or in New Mexico where 75% continued, 22% entered college, and 4% completed college.

When asked what changes they would make if they could in the high school from which they graduated, 54% of the bordertown graduates said "none." Most frequent suggestions for needed changes were that more counseling was needed, more vocational courses should be offered, and better training and more courses in English would have been helpful.

In response to a question as to what the high school did best for them, the most frequent comments were that they had learned to get along with other people, particularly Anglos, that they have received a superior education, had learned more English, and had been prepared and motivated for further education.

When asked whether or not they would take a different course of action after high school if they could start over, 67% said that they would. Many regretted that they had not gone to college, some that they had not gone to college immediately after high school, and others that they had dropped out of college. A number wished that they had prepared themselves for a different occupation. More bordertown graduates were dissatisfied with their course of action after high school (67%) than were Indian high school graduates in general in the Southwest (48%). Since bordertown graduates attended college in greater numbers (42% to 26%), it would appear that they had set their goals higher, perhaps unrealistically high.

Answers to a question as to whether they had experienced prejudice while in high school revealed that about 80% felt that they had not and 20% felt that they had. These figures are consistent with those for Indian students in general in the Southwest who were enrolled in schools where they were a minority.

Asked whether they considered themselves to have been successful, 35% answered in the affirmative, 22% indicated partial success, and 44% responded negatively. The negative response was twice as frequent for bordertown graduates as it was for the Southwest in general. The reason may be that the educational experiences received by bordertown graduates have caused them, not only to set higher goals for themselves, but also to use different criteria for judging success than are used by many of the other graduates, particularly those who have received their high school education on reservations or in segregated off-reservation schools.

Recent Graduates

From the records of bordertown dormitories and schools it was determined that a total of 384 bordertown dormitory students graduated from high school in the 1969 and 1970 classes. Information received from dormitories and schools indicated that three of the graduates were deceased. Of the remaining 381, 35% were attending college, 20% were enrolled in vocational-technical schools, 17% were working, 8% were in the service, 7% were housewives, 6% were unemployed, and the activities of 6% were unknown. In addition to those who were currently enrolled in colleges or vocational schools, a number who were working

or were in the service had either completed a vocational course or had attended college for a year or less. If these were added to the above figures, vocational school entrees would total 22% and college entrees 38%. Quite a number of 1970 graduates who were either working or staying at home when the information was gathered in December were expecting to enter vocational schools or colleges after the first of the year.

Ten of the recent graduates were interviewed. None of the ten had any criticisms of the high school attended. Favorable comments made by most students were that the school had provided a superior education which prepared them for further education, and had taught them to work together with white students. They all rated the bordertown education as much better than BIA or reservation public, and advocated strongly that the program be continued, although a few qualified this recommendation with the observation that dormitory life needed improvement. Three graduates had no criticisms of the dormitory, but the other seven had multiple criticisms, the most prevalent being the lack of activities, the rigid rules, and some incompetent and disinterested staff members.

In a recent meeting of the Shiprock Agency School Board a resolution was drafted and passed unanimously requesting the renewal of a contract between the Bureau and the Aztec School District ensuring the extension of the Bordertown Dormitory Program for another 20 years. It was also recommended that dormitory facilities be remodeled and expanded and that the enrollment be doubled.

## VIII. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

### Comparative Costs

The BIA Navajo Area Education Office supplied figures for fiscal year 1969-70 showing costs of educating students in the bordertown dormitories and Bureau boarding schools under its jurisdiction. These figures are presented in Table 8. Figures for Albuquerque were not available.

Including both money paid by the Bureau to school districts and the cost of operating the dormitories at public school sites, the average cost of educating a bordertown student was $1,921 as compared to $2,176 for a Bureau boarding school student, a difference of $255 in favor of bordertown schools. This per capita difference, when projected, totals over one-half million dollars less that it cost the Bureau to educate the approximately 2,000 bordertown students than it would have cost to educate them in Bureau boarding schools. However, at least some of the higher costs of Bureau boarding school education may be due to the large number of students assigned to Intermountain for "social reasons," thus necessitating more specialized personnel and programs there.

An earlier study showed 1962-64 fiscal year costs of educating students in bordertown schools and Bureau boarding schools to be about the same, with a per capita differential of $17 in favor of Bureau boarding schools.[4] At that time per capita costs were $1,427 for bordertown students and $1,410 for Bureau boarding school students. Between 1964 and 1970 bordertown expenditures rose 35% and Bureau boarding school expenditures rose 54%.

### Bureau Support to School Districts

The Bureau has paid bordertown school districts full per capita tuition costs for bordertown dormitory students since the initiation of the program. School districts also receive funds to cover the costs of such services as transportation, lunches, parental costs, and tutoring or other remedial or enrichment programs. In addition, the three New Mexico school districts have received full state aid

TABLE 8

Costs of Educating Navajo Students
In Bordertown and Bureau Boarding Schools

| Schools | | 1970 Enrollment | Costs | Per Capita Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bordertown Schools | | | | |
| Aztec | Dormitory Operation | 145 | 173,494 | 1,196 |
| | District Education Contract | | 85,881 | 592 |
| | Bus Contract | | 5,000 | 35 |
| | Sub-total | 145 | 264,375 | 1,823 |
| Flagstaff | Dormitory Operation | 329 | 357,078 | 1,085 |
| | District Education Contract | | 262,708 | 798 |
| | Bus Contract | | 19,000 | 58 |
| | Sub-total | 329 | 638,786 | 1,941 |
| Gallup | Dormitory Operation | 386 | 411,589 | 1,066 |
| | District Education Contract | | 347,977 | 901 |
| | Bus Contract | | 23,000 | 60 |
| | Sub-total | 386 | 782,566 | 2,027 |
| Holbrook | Dormitory Operation | 433 | 398,091 | 919 |
| | District Education Contract | | 314,898 | 727 |
| | Sub-total | 433 | 712,989 | 1,646 |
| Snowflake | Dormitory Operation | 127 | 194,113 | 1,528 |
| | District Education Contract | | 113,597 | 894 |
| | Sub-total | 127 | 307,710 | 2,422 |
| Richfield | Dormitory Operation | 122 | 188,396 | 1,544 |
| | District Education Contract | | 86,394 | 708 |
| | Sub-total | 122 | 274,790 | 2,252 |
| Winslow | Dormitory Operation | 250 | 304,998 | 1,220 |
| | District Education Contract | | 156,072 | 624 |
| | Sub-total | 250 | 461,070 | 1,844 |
| Bordertown Schools Total | | 1,792 | 3,442,286 | 1,921 |
| Bureau Boarding Schools | | | | |
| Intermountain School | | 1,749 | 4,308,712 | 2,464 |
| Many Farms High School | | 954 | 1,790,198 | 1,877 |
| Wingate High School | | 733 | 1,377,429 | 1,879 |
| Bureau Boarding Schools Total | | 3,436 | 7,476,339 | 2,176 |

for bordertown students, and Richfield, Utah, has received partial state aid.

A recent United States General Accounting Office (GAO) report pointed out that 97% of the bordertown dormitory Students attending Arizona public schools were residents of the state, and that many were residents of the county and of the school district where they were attending school.[5] The report also stated that about 92% of the bordertown students attending school in one New Mexico district were residents of the state and 79% were residents of the district. Reference also was made to the overlapping of federal and state funds being paid to bordertown school districts in New Mexico.

Taking the position that the state is responsible for the education of Indian children resident in the state and that federal assistance should be provided on a supplemental-need basis only, the GAO report recommends that the Bureau not pay the full per capita cost of educating those bordertown dormitory students who are attending school in their state of residence. Richfield (Sevier District), Utah, is the only bordertown school district that would not be seriously affected by the implementation of the above recommendation. A large majority of the Richfield bordertown students are from other states, while a majority at each of the other bordertown dormitories are in-state students.

If, as has been suggested by some, the first step in reduction of federal funding should be to discontinue Bureau full per capita tuition payments on a basis of district rather than state residence, Albuquerque, Aztec, and Snowflake, in addition to Richfield, would be largely unaffected, since a majority of their bordertown students reside in other districts. Such a policy, however, would affect Gallup greatly, and Flagstaff, Holbrook, and Winslow in varying degrees. Advocates of the "district responsibility" position reason that a public school is obligated to enroll all Indian students resident in the district who seek admittance, whether attendance is made possible by virtue of proximity to the school, access to a bus, lodging with relatives, temporary adoption into a foster home, or residence in a dormitory. Therefore, no basis exists for demanding greater funding for dormitory students who are residents of the district, and bordertown schools should move toward assuming greater financial responsibility for the education of these students.

Logically, of course, if the state were to assume the responsibility for the education of its reservation students, it should pay its share of the educational costs for its bordertown students attending out-of-state schools. For example, Arizona, rather than the Bureau,

would then pay Richfield, Utah, for educational costs of Arizona students attending its schools. This brings up the knotty problem of tuition agreements between states. If financial responsibility is placed on a district, rather than a state basis, then inter-district tuition agreements, often between districts in different states, becomes a problem. As can be seen, the financial considerations are quite complex.

The consensus of opinion of bordertown school superintendents and the sample of board members interviewed was that the Bureau should continue to pay full per capita tuition costs. The reasoning seemed to be based, not only on the fact that bordertown students reside on land that is largely tax free, but also that the remoteness of residence or social factors make it necessary for bordertown students to attend a school having boarding facilities, if not a bordertown school then a Bureau boarding school. It seemed just as logical to public school officials for the Bureau to provide full financial support for the education of these students at a bordertown school as to do so at a Bureau boarding school, especially since it costs less to educate them in a bordertown school and, in the officials opinion, students receive a better education. In fact, in a meeting of representatives of the three New Mexico bordertown schools last November they went on record as requesting that consideration be given in new contract negotiations to paying per capita costs on the basis of BIA education costs rather than bordertown school costs. Also suggested for consideration in future negotiations was an initial capital outlay of federal funds to bordertown school districts for buildings and equipment. Holbrook and Winslow, Arizona, also indicated that federal funds for facilities might be needed if new long-term agreements are made.

## IX. SUMMARY

In a survey of the Bordertown Dormitory Program an evaluation team visited schools and dormitories at all eight bordertown sites--Albuquerque, Aztec, and Gallup, New Mexico; Flagstaff, Holbrook, Snowflake, and Winslow, Arizona; and Richfield, Utah. Information was gathered from school and dormitory records, team inspection and observation, and interviews with students, dormitory staff, school faculty and administration, townspeople, parents, and graduates.

The evaluation team consisted of seven members, six of whom were Indian teachers working as interns in a Pennsylvania State University masters degree program.

### The Bordertown Dormitory Students

Total enrollment in the bordertown dormitories numbers 2,010, with 93% in grades 6-12 and 65% in grades 9-12. Comparison with the 1960 enrollment, when only 25% were enrolled in grades 9-12, points up the trend toward heavier enrollment in the high school grades.

Interviews with a random sample of 407 students representing approximately 50% of the seniors, 40% of the juniors, 25% of the sophomores, 15% of the freshmen, and 10% of the eighth grade students, revealed that 94% live on a reservation, 75% come from homes in which Navajo is the principal language spoken, and 58% could speak no English when they first entered school. Nearly half of the parents had received no schooling and the average parental schooling was only 3.5 years. In spite of this background the team rated 80% of the students interviewed as good to excellent in expressing themselves in English and 60% as demonstrating self-assurance and poise while being interviewed.

An analysis of data gathered in 1968 by SWCEL for a study of school dropout of Indian students in the Southwest between enrollment in grade 8 and graduation from high school reveals a dropout rate of 27.5% for Indian students enrolled in bordertown schools. This rate is lower than the rates of 38.7%, 34.7%, and 33.9% for Indian students in the Southwest, Arizona, and New Mexico respectively. It is also

slightly lower than the rate of 28.6% for Navajo students enrolled in all types of schools. Since a large majority of those in the bordertown school sample were dormitory students it can be assumed that the bordertown rate is representative of the actual dropout rate for dormitory students.

## Academic Achievement

From grade point averages and class rankings it was found that the academic achievement of bordertown dormitory students is somewhat lower on the average than that of other students. If one were to divide students into four groups of equal numbers on the basis of grades, with group one highest and group four lowest, very few bordertown students would be in group one and about twice the expected number would be in group three; about normal numbers would be in groups two and four. This achievement pattern was confirmed by opinions of school people and dormitory students themselves.

An analysis of available achievement test results indicates that average scores for bordertown dormitory students were somewhat below national norms at the ninth grade level and fell even farther below national norms at each succeeding grade level. However, bordertown dormitory students scored slightly higher at the ninth grade level than did students in BIA boarding schools or reservation public schools, and also registered greater gains as they progressed through high school.

## Schools and Communities

Bordertown dormitory students, generally, are attending schools having excellent facilities, well-qualified teachers, high scholastic standards, and broad offerings of subjects and activities. A number of schools have outstanding courses and facilities for vocational-technical education and many dormitory students are availing themselves of these opportunities.

Schools were attempting to meet the needs of those bordertown dormitory students having serious deficiencies in reading and English in various ways. Most schools seemed to be making a serious attempt to do this without segregating dormitory students into special classes.

Almost entirely absent from the instructional programs were courses in Indian history, culture, and language. Of the 11 high schools and 12 junior high schools surveyed, one high school offered three sections of a Navajo language course, one junior high offered a class in Navajo culture, history, and language, four schools were

incorporating some units on Indian culture, history, or language into other courses, and 17 schools were without such courses or units.

Most school counselors, though apparently very interested in the dormitory students, were carrying such heavy counseling loads that they did not have sufficient time to adequately counsel them. The team encountered no Indian counselors in the schools surveyed.

Dormitory students were observed to cluster together in the school cafeterias, and in most classes unless seated by teachers, but were seen to mingle considerably with non-Indians in halls and recreation areas. However, this same tendency to segregate themselves was also noted for other minority groups and for certain types of Anglos.

When observed in class, dormitory students were responsive and expressed themselves quite well in English when called upon to recite, but they seldom volunteered to recite or contributed to class discussions. They appeared to be happy and at ease in their school settings and seemed to be interested in their school work. A majority of teachers rated the oral English ability of dormitory students as fair to excellent, but many said that they have greater problems with written English and with reading comprehension.

Dormitory students were participating in extracurricular school activities quite well, but somewhat less on the average than other students. While comprising 18% of the school enrollments they accounted for 15% of the participants in the various activities. Participation was above average in athletics and chorus, about average on newspaper and annual staffs, below average in various kinds of clubs, and very low in such activities as student council, cheerleading, forensics, drama, and school dances. About one-third of the students did not participate in any school activity, about one-third participated in only one activity, and the other one-third, who were in two or more activities, actually accounted for 70% of the participation. Almost one half of the dormitory students indicated that having enough money to participate in activities was a problem.

An overwhelming majority of dormitory students liked the school they were attending, felt that they were well accepted by other students, and thought that teachers were as interested in them as in other students. When asked what they did not like about the school, 20% had some complaints or suggestions. Some of these were about teachers who showed more interest in white students, attitudes and

behavior of some non-Indian students toward them, poor cafeteria food, and the lack of courses in Navajo history, culture, and language.

Dormitory students thought that they were receiving a superior education because they were going to school with non-Indians, scholastic standards were high, they had good teachers, and they had to speak English most of the time. In fact, 90% rated the education they were receiving as better than that of a Bureau boarding school and 56% rated it as better than that of a reservation public school.

After graduation from high school 58% expect to go to college, 16% to vocational-technical school, 10% to work or into military service, and 16% were uncertain about their plans.

All principals of the schools that were visited and a total of 225 teachers were interviewed or completed questionnaires. A large majority of teachers and principals thought that the presence of dormitory students in the school was beneficial to other students because it helped them to learn to respect, appreciate, and get along with students of another race and cultural background. A minority of them saw disadvantages as well as advantages, with a few expressing concern that the large and growing enrollment of students from minority groups in their particular schools might lower the academic standards.

Most teachers and principals thought that the bordertown program was good for the Indian students, but a few were doubtful because they felt that dormitory students were losing too much of their culture, were too far removed from home and parents, that schools were geared to non-Indian students and were not meeting the needs of dormitory students, and that dormitory conditions were poor. Teachers thought that as large a proportion of dormitory as other students in their classes were capable of graduating from high school and from college. Continuation of the program was favored by 84% of the teachers and principals.

Though a majority of the teachers thought that it was important, only a few had received any special training for teaching Indian students. The team met, or was informed of, only five Indian teachers in the bordertown schools surveyed, of which two were Navajos.

All superintendents were very positive in their opinions that the bordertown program had been successful for the Indian student. A majority also felt that having the dormitory students in their schools had been good for other students and the school; but in three districts, Gallup, Holbrook, and Winslow, which enroll many other Indian

students, superintendents indicated that the presence of the Indian students had little effect. Two of these districts, Winslow and Holbrook, did not wish to accept any increase in dormitory enrollment at the secondary level so as not to exceed their present proportion of Indian students in their high schools. Other superintendents indicated that no limitation has been placed on numbers of dormitory students and several, notably from Aztec, Snowflake, and Richfield, mentioned the possibility of increases in dormitory enrollment.

Superintendents favored continuation of the program, but most mentioned satisfactory financial arrangements as a qualifying factor, and others the enrollment limitation problem.

Almost without exception the sample of townspeople who were interviewed, which included some school board members, indicated strong support for the bordertown program. A few school board members, though favorable, voiced some concerns about such problems as crowded classrooms, ratio of Indian students, and possible funding changes. Only one citizen, a board member, was somewhat negative toward continuation.

The Dormitories

When students were asked if there were things about the school or dormitory they disliked, only 15% had criticisms of the school, but 60% had criticisms of the dormitory. There were seven criticisms of the dormitory for every one of the school. Students seemed to be happiest at Aztec, Albuquerque, Holbrook, and Snowflake dormitories and less contented at Flagstaff, Gallup, Richfield, and Winslow. Complaints in order of frequency were of buildings that are inadequate, rules that are too numerous and rigid, staff who are unsympathetic and incapable of helping students with school work and personal problems, food that is deficient in quality and quantity, and activities that are lacking, especially on weekends.

Most dormitory principals considered buildings, staff, and programs to be inadequate. They pointed to the need for rooms for older students, libraries with sufficient reference and reading materials, more recreation and activity space and equipment, and better maintenance. Also cited as needs were upgrading of staff positions and more staff, especially trained recreation directors and fully qualified counselors. Also, most dormitory principals felt the need for more financial and moral support from the Bureau.

Staff members frequently mentioned the need for additional staff, better facilities, and more supplies.

Team inspection of buildings led to much the same conclusions about dormitory facilities as those expressed by principals, staff, and students. Sleeping and living quarters, except at Albuquerque, were of the barracks type providing no privacy, and were crowded; library facilities and meeting rooms were lacking or inadequate; sanitation facilities were substandard; lounges had to double as rumpus rooms; laundry facilities were limited; food storage and refrigeration capacity were minimal; and playground and recreation facilities and equipment were inadequate at some sites. Most buildings were poorly maintained, Manuelito Hall at Gallup being in the worst repair.

## Evaluations by Parents and Graduates

Interviews were held with the parents of 42 families having a total of 193 children attending school, of whom 59 were bordertown dormitory students. All 42 parents were favorable toward the bordertown program and a majority thought that the bordertown schools were providing the best education. When parents having younger preschool children were asked where they would like them to attend school, about 50% indicated a preference for bordertown schools. About 33% favored Bureau schools, but some of these indicated that they would like to start their children in Bureau schools and enroll them in bordertown schools later. All parents except two were definitely in favor of continuing the bordertown program. One of the two was uncertain and the other thought that it should not be continued if enough public schools could be built on the reservation to enroll all students. When asked what was good about the bordertown program, parents most frequently mentioned going to school with non-Indians, getting a better education, learning English better, and experiencing more competition.

When asked what they disliked about the bordertown program, there were no complaints by parents about the schools, but about half of them had one or more criticisms of the dormitories. Some of these were that dormitory facilities were inadequate, there should be more staff who understand and are interested in students, better transportation should be provided students, there is too much drinking by students, and there should be more provision for recreation.

A sample of 24 bordertown dormitory high school graduates of Spring 1962 were interviewed. This sample represents an estimated 20-25% of the bordertown dormitory graduates of 1962. Of the 24 graduates interviewed, 79% had continued their education, 42% had attended college, 8% had completed college, and 46% had

completed a vocational training program. Some had received both vocational and college training. The above figures for bordertown students are substantially higher than for all Indian high school graduates of 1962 in Arizona, where 70% continued their education, 18% enrolled in college, and 3% completed college, or in New Mexico, where 75% continued, 22% entered college, and 4% completed college.

When asked what changes they would make if they could in the high school from which they graduated, a majority said "none," and others offered such suggestions as more counseling, more vocational courses, and more courses in English. The graduates of 1962 thought that the best advantages they had received from the school were that they had learned to get along with other people, particularly Anglos; they had received a superior education; had learned more English; and had been prepared and motivated to go on with their education.

Information received from dormitories and schools on 1969 and 1970 bordertown graduates revealed that of 381 graduates, 35% were attending college, 20% were enrolled in vocational-technical schools, 17% were working, 8% were in the service, 7% were housewives, 6% were unemployed, and the activities of 6% were unknown. Some who were working or were in the service had completed a vocational course or had attended college, and some who were either working or staying at home when the information was gathered in December were expecting to enter college or vocational school after the first of the year.

Ten of these recent graduates were interviewed. All praised their school, particularly for having provided a superior education that enabled them to further their education and for having taught them to work together with white students. They all rated the bordertown education as much superior to BIA or reservation public and strongly recommended the continuation of the program. All but three had criticisms of the dormitories, the most frequent being lack of activities, rigid rules, and some incompetent and disinterested staff members.

## Financial Considerations

For the 1969-70 fiscal year, the average cost of educating a bordertown dormitory student was $1,921 as compared to $2,176 for a Bureau boarding school student. This amounts to about one-half million dollars less that it cost the Bureau to educate the approximately 2,000 bordertown students than it would have cost to educate them in Bureau boarding schools. Some of the higher cost of Bureau education may be due to more specialized personnel and programs at Intermountain School to meet the needs of the many students

enrolled there for "social reasons." A comparison of present costs with earlier costs reveals that between 1964 and 1970 Bureau boarding school per pupil expenditures increased 54% while bordertown expenditures rose only 35%.

A recent United States General Accounting Office (GAO) report takes the position that the state is responsible for the education of Indian children resident in the state and that federal assistance should be provided on a supplemental-need basis only. The GAO report recommends that the Bureau not continue to pay the full per capita tuition cost to bordertown schools for dormitory students who are attending school in their state of residence as it has been doing since the initiation of the program. However, the consensus of opinion of public school officials is that the Bureau should continue to pay the full per capita tuition costs. The reasoning appears to be that bordertown dormitory students would otherwise have to be educated in Bureau boarding schools, and it seems just as logical to bordertown school officials for the Bureau to provide full financial support for the education of these students at a bordertown school as to do so at a Bureau boarding school where it costs more and the education received is not as good. The New Mexico schools have indicated that consideration should be given in new contract negotiations to figuring per capita costs on the basis of BIA education costs rather than bordertown school costs. Also, a number of school officials have suggested that an outlay of federal funds for buildings and equipment should be considered in negotiations for new long-term agreements.

## X. RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation team has attempted to be objective in gathering and analyzing data, and in translating findings into recommendations. The recommendations which follow were suggested by various team members and were considered and approved by a majority of the team.

### Continuation of the Bordertown Dormitory Program

The team recommends continuation of the Bordertown Dormitory Program beyond present agreements because the opinions and desires expressed by parents, graduates, students, teachers, school officials, and townspeople strongly support this position. Findings on costs, academic progress of students, and post-high school activities of graduates tend to validate this recommendation.

Although the Navajo Tribe has expressed preference for the development of an educational system on the reservation, similar to the pattern of public education in the United States, so that children can remain near their parents, it will be many years before this can be accomplished. In the meantime, the Bordertown Dormitory Program offers an option to parents who must place their children in a dormitory but prefer that they attend a public school. It seems important to keep this option open to Navajo parents.

### Schools

Few of the 225 teachers interviewed had received any special training for teaching Indian students, but most felt that it was important. School administrators should take the responsibility for arranging and encouraging cultural awareness training for teachers, and teachers themselves should make an effort to enroll in courses that will help them to better understand and appreciate the cultural heritage of the Indian students.

The team encountered no counselors who were Indian, and met only two Indian teachers in the 23 junior and senior high schools visited. However, team members were informed of three other Indian teachers, bringing the total to five, of whom two were Navajos. Although Indian teachers and counselors, particularly Navajo, have

been in short supply in the past, the phenomenal increase in enrollment of Indian students in college in recent years should help to alleviate this situation. Every effort should be made by bordertown school administrators to recruit Indian teachers and counselors, preferably Navajo. In some districts there are enough Indian students in a number of schools to warrant placing an Indian counselor in each school. In other districts, where Indian enrollments are relatively small, one Indian counselor could serve the Indian students in all the schools. Indian counselors, with the aid of Indian teachers, might be used as specialists in Indian education to provide inservice training for other faculty members. Counselors of Indian students should be assigned less than the normal counseling load because of the time required to meet the special needs of Indian students. More and better counseling of Indian students is definitely needed.

Courses in tribal history and culture, and in language, should be offered at the junior and senior high school levels for those Indian and non-Indian students who wish to take them. In addition, units on tribal and regional Indian history and culture should be included in certain other social studies courses so that all students learn something about the Indian heritage.

Greater efforts need to be made to encourage participation of dormitory students in school affairs. Since Indian students are greatly in the minority and tend not to be aggressive, it is up to faculty members and non-Indian students to invite and encourage them to join clubs, run for offices, try out for teams, and get involved in various ways in school activities. One high school counselor commented that with all the hue and cry today among middle class white youth about treatment of minority groups he is still waiting for them to move toward acceptance of the Indian students in his school. It was noted that several of the schools did not have cross country teams. Since this is a relatively inexpensive sport in which many Indian boys are interested and can excel, consideration should be given to its inclusion in the athletic program. Also, Indian clubs, open to all students, could be initiated in those schools not now sponsoring them.

Continuing efforts should be made to find ways of helping dormitory students to improve their oral and written English and reading skills. In a 1966 study of achievement in one bordertown school, poor reading ability was found to be the factor that had the greatest effect upon academic retardation of dormitory students.[6]

In Albuquerque, bordertown dormitory students are enrolled in one elementary school, four junior high schools, and four senior high schools, with a maximum of about 60 in any one school. This

dispersion of junior and senior high school students creates serious transportation problems, particularly at odd hours, and results in many students either not bothering to participate in after-school activities or experiencing much wasted time and inconvenience waiting for rides. Albuquerque dormitory students had a very low school activities participation rate, with 47% involved in no school activity. Another disadvantage of the Albuquerque arrangement is that the schools are so big and the Navajo students so few that to provide special courses, counseling, and activities geared to the needs of Indian students is not feasible. Furthermore, in some classes and activities the dormitory students find themselves alone, without friends, and get discouraged. A counselor in one of the high schools pointed out that one-tenth of his counseling load is bordertown dormitory students, but that one-third of the requests he had for change of classes at the end of the first semester came from bordertown students, many of whom were lonesome and discouraged in their classes.

It would seem advisable for all Albuquerque dormitory senior high school students to attend Valley High School and all junior high school students to attend Garfield Junior High School. Both of these schools are within reasonable walking distance of the dormitory, which would simplify the bussing problems and free the students from being so utterly dependent upon vehicular transportation. Albuquerque, like other dormitories, has an evening tutoring program using teachers from the public schools. An advantage of having students in one rather than several schools would be that tutors and students would then be from the same school and the acquaintanceship established in the tutoring program would carry over to the school, and vice versa.

At one time Albuquerque Public Schools had a policy of not accepting a bordertown dormitory enrollment in excess of 5% in any one school. However, this policy is no longer adhered to, and the present superintendent favors placing more students in fewer schools and thinks that 15% in a school is not too many.

Dormitories

The Gallup dormitory, Manuelito Hall, should be abandoned as soon as possible and a replacement built on a site within walking distance of Gallup High School and John F. Kennedy Junior High School.

Other dormitory plants should be remodeled and expanded to provide small rooms housing 2-4 students, libraries with adequate reference and reading materials, better laundry and sanitary facilities, rumpus and hobby rooms, small conference and instrumental practice

rooms, canteen facilities, more food storage and refrigeration space, adequate gymnasiums and auditoriums, better playground areas, and more attractively landscaped grounds.

Counseling services at most dormitories should be improved. At most locations organized counseling programs with more, fully qualified, counselors are needed. Counseling should be separated from dormitory control and disciplinary responsibilities. At Gallup, the Bureau's new guidance program, which separates these functions, is being initiated, and at Flagstaff consideration is being given to contracting with Northern Arizona University for counseling services.

One of the most frequent complaints by students was lack of suitable activities, especially on weekends. Each dormitory should have a trained recreation director to work with students in planning and directing a well-rounded recreation program.

Opportunities for musical instruction are lacking in bordertown dormitories. Part-time teachers should be employed to provide individual and group instruction in instrument and voice. This instruction could result not only in the formation of choral groups and instrumental ensembles within the dormitory, but also in giving more students the necessary training and confidence to join musical organizations in the schools.

There should be a general upgrading of dormitory staff positions and an increase in the number of younger employees.

Better communications from dormitories to parents would be desirable. Perhaps a periodic newsletter from the office, or student-produced news sheet, or both, could go out to parents, in addition to grade reports and announcements of vacations and special events.

Transportation is a problem of greater or lesser degree at most dormitories. At Winslow, junior and senior high school students must walk about five miles each day back and forth from dormitory to school. Bussing is definitely needed there. At most other sites--Albuquerque, Aztec, Flagstaff, Gallup, and Richfield--where all or most students must be bussed to school, regular schedules present no problem, but more transportation is needed for small groups, or single students, at odd hours. More transportation also should be made available to many dormitories for weekend activities.

Relations between dormitories and schools appear to be cordial and there is frequent communication on routine matters. However, little joint planning seems to be taking place on a continuing basis.

Although dormitory principals and counselors are invited to attend school faculty meetings, and sometimes do, such sessions do not provide opportunities to concentrate on matters vital to the welfare of dormitory students. It is suggested that a dormitory-school council be set up in each bordertown community, comprised of representatives from faculty and students of the school, and staff and students of the dormitory. Such a committee could review the school program, as it pertains to dormitory students, and make recommendations for improvements to school administrators, curriculum committees, faculties, and student councils. It could perform a similar function for the dormitory program.

Such a council might find ways of bringing about greater involvement of dormitory students in school and community activities. It might be able to suggest or sponsor events which would open up the dormitories to more visitation by non-Indian students, teachers, and other townspeople, and would result in more visitation of dormitory students in community homes.

Many dormitory students are handicapped, both academically and socially, by not being present on the day that school opens in the fall. Also, students should be brought into the dormitories early if necessary to avoid having to take them out of classes during the first week or two of school for medical examination and treatment. New students should report early for a thorough orientation to their new school.

It would be very helpful to schools in determining class schedules and teacher assignments if tentative lists of bordertown students were furnished to schools well in advance of school opening. It would also enable schools to help new students to choose an appropriate program of studies if student records were to arrive before, or at the time, the new students enrolled.

## Financial Considerations

There definitely are two sides to the debate about the level at which the Bureau should fund the bordertown schools for the education of dormitory students. There are convincing arguments on both sides. Obviously, if the Navajo Tribe decides that it wishes to continue the Bordertown Dormitory Program, and the Bureau concurs, representatives of states, school districts, Tribe, Bureau, and possibly other agencies, should meet and make the necessary compromises for the negotiation of new long-term agreements.

The bordertown schools should not be expected to suffer financially by enrolling dormitory students; neither should the schools expect to make a financial profit so as to better support other phases of the school program, as some have been able to do. The federal government must recognize that it has a responsibility for the education of reservation Indian students who are eligible for Bureau dormitory facilities, whether such students live in a Bureau dormitory and attend a Bureau school, or whether they live in a Bureau dormitory and attend a public school. On the other hand, the school districts and states should recognize that they have a responsibility for the education of all Indian students residing within their borders.

The funding question is complex and has many ramifications. The team felt that limitations of time and resources did not permit a sufficiently thorough study of the problem to warrant more specific recommendations than the above.

## REFERENCES


[1]Bass, Willard P., An Analysis of Academic Achievement of Indian High School Students in Federal and Public Schools, A First Year Progress Report, Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1968.

_____, The American Indian High School Graduate in the Southwest, Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1969.

[2]Owens, Charles S., and Willard P. Bass, The American Indian High School Dropout in the Southwest, Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1969.

[3]Aberle, Sophie D., Preliminary Survey of Some Peripheral Dormitories, Albuquerque, 1964.

[4]Coombs, L. Madison, Dorothy Hanlon, and Glenn C. Lundeen, Report to the Senate Committee on the Navajo Bordertown Dormitory Program, Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1965.

[5]United States General Accounting Office, Administration of Program for Aid to Public School Education of Indian Children Being Improved, Washington, D. C., 1970.

[6]Melville, Robert S., What Are the Factors Which Enhance or Retard Educational Achievement of Navajo Indian Students in the Sevier School District, Logan, Utah: Utah State University, 1966.

## APPENDIX A

### Schools and Dormitories Visited by the Evaluation Team

Bordertown Dormitories:

| | |
|---|---|
| Albuquerque Dormitory | Albuquerque, New Mexico |
| Aztec Dormitory | Aztec, New Mexico |
| Flagstaff Dormitory | Flagstaff, New Mexico |
| Manuelito Hall | Gallup, New Mexico |
| Holbrook Dormitory | Holbrook, Arizona |
| Richfield Dormitory | Richfield, Utah |
| Snowflake Dormitory | Snowflake, Arizona |
| Winslow Dormitory | Winslow, Arizona |

Bordertown Public Schools:

| | |
|---|---|
| Del Norte High School | Albuquerque, New Mexico |
| Garfield Junior High School | |
| McKinley Junior High School | |
| Valley High School | |
| | |
| Aztec High School | Aztec, New Mexico |
| C. V. Koogler Junior High School | |
| | |
| Coconino High School | Flagstaff, Arizona |
| East Flagstaff Junior High School | |
| Flagstaff High School | |
| Flagstaff Junior High School | |
| | |
| Gallup High School | Gallup, New Mexico |
| Gallup Junior High School | |
| John F. Kennedy Junior High School | |
| | |
| Holbrook High School | Holbrook, Arizona |
| Holbrook Junior High School | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Richfield High School (Sevier District)<br>Richfield Junior High School | Richfield, Utah |
| South Sevier High School<br>South Sevier Junior High School | Monroe, Utah |
| Snowflake Union High School | Snowflake, Arizona |
| Winslow High School<br>Winslow Junior High School | Winslow, Arizona |

APPENDIX B

## School Enrollment Guidelines*

## 1970-71 School Year

### General Policy

School-age Navajo boys and girls should stay at home with their parents and attend school on a day basis if this is at all possible.

They should attend:

1. A PUBLIC SCHOOL if one is available, and if not

2. A FEDERAL SCHOOL on a day basis if one is available, and if not

3. A BORDERTOWN DORMITORY or FEDERAL BOARDING SCHOOL.

Exceptions are children recommended for special enrollment by the Branch of Social Services or Department of Public Health and approved by the Education Program Administrator.

### Bordertown Dormitories

A. Pupils, age 6 and above who have an older brother or sister enrolled in a bordertown dormitory are eligible if their parents desire and if they:

   1. Cannot attend any school on a day basis and are not more than one year retarded. (Bordertown dormitories will accept a pupil who is more than one year retarded if, before enrolling, the school superintendent of the town where the dormitory is located has an opportunity to review the cumulative record folder and gives his approval.)

---

*From School Enrollment Guidelines, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office, Division of Education, Window Rock, Arizona.

2. Are approved by the Agency Education Program Administrator.

B. Pupils, age 6 and above who do not have an older brother or sister enrolled in the Bordertown Dormitory Program are eligible if their parents desire and if they:

1. Cannot attend any school on a day basis, and are not more than one year retarded. (Bordertown dormitories will accept a pupil who is more than one year retarded if, before enrolling, the school superintendent of the town where the dormitory is located has an opportunity to review the cumulative record folder and gives his approval.)

2. Have completed the highest grade of the home school and reside where the distance to a bordertown dormitory is no greater than to the nearest available reservation school, and

3. Are approved by the Agency Education Program Administrator.

The only exceptions are:

1. Social Welfare cases.

# APPENDIX C

## Responses of Bordertown Students to Interview Guide Items

TABLE 9

Responses of Bordertown Students
to Interview Guide Items

| | | Aztec | Albuquerque | Flagstaff | Gallup | Holbrook | Richfield | Snowflake | Winslow | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students interviewed | | 38 | 53 | 75 | 45 | 61 | 42 | 37 | 56 | 407 |
| Live on reservation? | Yes | 97% | 92% | 96% | 69% | 98% | 98% | 97% | 98% | 94% |
| Age when started school: | 5 years | 16% | 6% | 24% | 13% | 27% | 12% | 24% | 21% | 19% |
| | 6 years | 62% | 69% | 59% | 78% | 65% | 60% | 65% | 66% | 65% |
| | 7 years | 14% | 23% | 15% | 4% | 8% | 24% | 11% | 13% | 14% |
| | 8 years | 8% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Spoke English when started school? | Yes | 43% | 38% | 20% | 38% | 8% | 19% | 8% | 32% | 25% |
| | A little | 6% | 6% | 15% | 9% | 36% | 7% | 27% | 21% | 17% |
| | No | 51% | 56% | 65% | 53% | 56% | 74% | 65% | 46% | 58% |
| Language spoken at home: | Tribal | 70% | 58% | 85% | 71% | 79% | 83% | 89% | 75% | 77% |
| | English | 14% | 23% | 4% | 11% | 3% | 0% | 5% | 14% | 9% |
| | Both | 16% | 19% | 11% | 18% | 18% | 17% | 5% | 11% | 13% |
| Average years of schooling of parents: | Fathers | 4.4 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 6.4 | 4.1 |
| | Mothers | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 3.1 |
| Kind of school attended before: | BIA | 84% | 45% | 75% | 45% | 66% | 60% | 68% | 62% | 64% |
| | Public | 16% | 55% | 25% | 55% | 32% | 40% | 32% | 36% | 35% |
| | Mission | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% |
| Grades here compared to prior school: | Lower | 16% | 31% | 20% | 14% | 25% | 24% | 27% | 30% | 23% |
| | Same | 58% | 62% | 67% | 81% | 44% | 64% | 62% | 46% | 60% |
| | Higher | 26% | 7% | 13% | 5% | 31% | 12% | 11% | 24% | 17% |
| Grades compared to non-Indian students: | Lower | 14% | 15% | 13% | 11% | 20% | 7% | 19% | 27% | 16% |
| | Same | 75% | 83% | 80% | 84% | 67% | 86% | 73% | 64% | 76% |
| | Higher | 11% | 2% | 7% | 4% | 13% | 7% | 8% | 9% | 8% |
| Are teachers as interested in Indian students as in non-Indian? | Yes | 84% | 84% | 68% | 71% | 77% | 76% | 65% | 75% | 75% |
| Average number of school activities participated in per student: | | 1.8 | .9 | 1.0 | .7 | 1.2 | .9 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Average number of criticisms of school per student: | | .1 | .1 | .3 | .4 | .1 | .2 | .3 | .2 | .2 |
| Average number of criticisms of dormitory per student: | | .3 | .4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | .7 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.1 |
| Percent of students who had criticisms of the school: | | 3% | 9% | 24% | 22% | 11% | 12% | 19% | 11% | 15% |
| Percent of students who had criticisms of the dormitory: | | 30% | 49% | 64% | 58% | 53% | 74% | 50% | 63% | 60% |
| Feel accepted by town students? | Yes | 92% | 89% | 95% | 84% | 84% | 79% | 81% | 93% | 88% |
| Have friends outside of the dormitory? | Yes | 100% | 100% | 99% | 98% | 93% | 93% | 89% | 98% | 97% |
| Is money to participate in activities a problem? | Yes | 39% | 32% | 57% | 50% | 38% | 45% | 43% | 54% | 45% |
| Is adequate clothing a problem? | Yes | 16% | 10% | 27% | 20% | 31% | 40% | 30% | 23% | 26% |
| Received tribal clothing this year: | Yes | 42% | 60% | 12% | 93% | 48% | 26% | 32% | 38% | 43% |
| Is satisfied with tribal clothing: | Yes | 84% | 88% | 58% | 76% | 70% | 62% | 54% | 58% | 70% |
| Sometimes work for pay in town: | Yes | 27% | 53% | 49% | 47% | 51% | 50% | 16% | 41% | 44% |
| Think that bordertown education is better than BIA school: | Yes | 97% | 92% | 83% | 80% | 95% | 93% | 97% | 86% | 90% |
| Think that bordertown education is better than reservation public school: | Yes | 79% | 49% | 49% | 44% | 57% | 62% | 43% | 68% | 56% |
| Expect to graduate from high school: | Yes | 97% | 100% | 99% | 98% | 98% | 100% | 97% | 100% | 99% |
| Plans after graduation: | College | 45% | 64% | 67% | 40% | 57% | 55% | 43% | 70% | 58% |
| | Vocational Training | 24% | 8% | 5% | 29% | 11% | 19% | 32% | 14% | 16% |
| | Work or military service | 8% | 6% | 13% | 9% | 16% | 17% | 5% | 7% | 10% |
| | Uncertain | 24% | 22% | 15% | 22% | 16% | 9% | 19% | 9% | 16% |

APPENDIX D

Responses of Bordertown School Teachers

to Faculty Questionnaire

TABLE 10

Responses of Bordertown School Teachers
to Faculty Questionnaire

| | | % Aztec | % Albuquerque | % Flagstaff | % Gallup | % Holbrook | % Richfield | % Snowflake | % Winslow | % Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Do bordertown students recite as much as other students? | No | 87 | 88 | 81 | 59 | 52 | 92 | 92 | 53 | 72 |
| How well have they mastered English? | Well | 0 | 6 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 29 | 12 |
| | Fair | 25 | 44 | 47 | 66 | 61 | 64 | 83 | 50 | 56 |
| | Most are handicapped | 75 | 50 | 34 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 17 | 21 | 31 |
| How much do they mix with other students? | A lot | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 10 |
| | Some | 63 | 12 | 19 | 51 | 23 | 44 | 17 | 35 | 30 |
| | Very little | 37 | 88 | 75 | 28 | 63 | 48 | 83 | 44 | 60 |
| Are they well accepted and liked by other students? | Yes | 87 | 56 | 88 | 98 | 100 | 96 | 83 | 100 | 90 |
| Are teachers as interested in bordertown dormitory students as in other students? | Yes | 100 | 91 | 88 | 91 | 84 | 100 | 83 | 91 | 90 |
| What percent of the bordertown dormitory students are capable of graduating from high school? | | 71 | 90 | 85 | 92 | 88 | 93 | 94 | 86 | 88 |
| From college? | | 47 | 42 | 44 | 41 | 58 | 53 | 60 | 47 | 47 |
| What percent of the non-Indian students are capable of graduating from high school? | | * | 92 | 88 | 89 | 91 | 84 | * | 89 | 89 |
| From college? | | * | 42 | 48 | 45 | 61 | 38 | * | 52 | 46 |
| Is the bordertown program good for the Indian students? | Yes | 63 | 59 | 63 | 81 | 94 | 88 | 83 | 79 | 77 |
| Is it good for the other students and the school? | Yes | 63 | 79 | 81 | 64 | 87 | 100 | 92 | 74 | 80 |
| Do you favor continuing the program? | Yes | 87 | 82 | 81 | 82 | 94 | 84 | 92 | 79 | 84 |
| Have you had special training for teaching Indian students? | Yes | 13 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 48 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 17 |
| Is such special training important? | Yes | 37 | 100 | 97 | 63 | 84 | 72 | 92 | 82 | 85 |

*These items were inadvertently omitted from the questionnaires used at Aztec and Snowflake.

APPENDIX E

Indian Education Program

Public School Contract

1. Definitions:

a. The term "Contracting Officer" as used in this contract refers to the official of the Bureau of Indian Affairs who executes this contract on behalf of the United States of America or any persons authorized to act for him in his official capacity or his successor.

b. The term "designated representative of the Contracting Officer" when used by the Contracting Officer during the performance of this contract means those persons designated by the Contracting Officer to perform certain specified functions required by the terms of the contract and the general provisions.

c. The term "eligible Indian children" as used in this contract means those children possessing one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood and whose parents live on Indian reservations or other tax exempt Indian-owned land.

d. "State" means the State contracting for the education of Indian children.

e. The term "school district" is the local unit of school administration as defined by the laws of the State in which it is located.

2. Indian Education Program. The contractor agrees:

a. To provide educational facilities, including classrooms, teachers, school supervision, instructional aids, gymnasiums, playgrounds, utilities, etc., for educating Indian children residing in dormitories operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in the Town of _____, under the same terms, conditions and standards, and in the same manner, with equal rights and privileges as are provided for all other children enrolled in the public schools of the District.

b. To accept under this contract, only such children as are certified to it by the Branch of Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

c. To furnish the Dormitory Principal with the name of each pupil's school, principal teacher and telephone number of the school; name of a person to contact in case of emergency, a school calendar, including a list of all activities in which the dormitory pupils will be expected to participate or permitted to attend, and report cards on all dormitory pupils.

d. To refer all requests for the release of dormitory pupils from school to the Dormitory Principal; to notify the Dormitory Principal immediately if and when a dormitory pupil becomes seriously ill or injured, and to report immediately to the Dormitory Principal the disappearance of any dormitory pupil from school during school hours.

e. That no dormitory pupil shall be permitted to participate in athletics without a physical examination and clearance by a physician.

f. To submit to the Contracting Officer all estimates, operational budgets, and such other reports as may be required by the Contracting Officer or his designated representative.

g. To furnish the dormitory pupils the regular noon luncheon furnished other children in attendance at the schools, each day the schools are in session during the term of this contract.

h. To furnish all necessary textbooks for the dormitory pupils.

3. Approved Budget. To provide funds on the basis of an approved budget submitted in accordance with the amended agreement with the School District.

4. Payments. For carrying out the program agreed upon, payment will be made to the Contractor in the amount of _____ dollars; payment to be made immediately following the receipt of invoices. Invoices are to be submitted to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office, P. O. Box 1060, Gallup, New Mexico 87301 for payment.

5. Contract Term - Termination - Renewal - Modification. This contract shall be for the period beginning _____, and ending on _____, subject to termination at any time upon sixty (60) days written notice given by either party to the other. Unless so terminated, the contract may be renewed annually by the Contracting Officer for successive one year terms commencing July 1 of each year by written

notice to the Contractor, upon submission and acceptance of an approved budget developed in accordance with the State or District plan, subject to the availability of appropriations and subject to termination during any such period as provided above. This contract may be modified in writing by mutual consent of both parties.

6. Access to Facilities. The Contracting Officer or his designated representatives shall have access to the schools in which Indian children are enrolled, at any time for observation, consultation and evaluation.

7. Inspection of Programs. The contractor shall make available to the Contracting Officer or his designated representatives such records and reports as may be necessary to enable them to conduct inspections of the school program in the schools receiving funds under this contract.

8. Approval. The contractor shall secure the approval of the Contracting Officer before appointing, or terminating the services of, any person responsible for the administration and supervision of the State Indian Education Program when funds provided under this contract are used to pay all or any part of his salary.